

REMARKS

This responds to the office action of 22 August 2007, which examined all pending claims 1-20. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, and 20 were rejected. Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 14, 18, and 19 were objected to. Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 11, 14, 16, and 19 are amended. Claims 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 17, and 20 are unchanged.

Paragraphs 1 to 3 of the office action set forth objections to the informal drawings as filed. These informal drawings have been replaced by the attached set of formal drawings. With respect to paragraph 1: figures 1, 2, and 3 are designated by the legend **prior art** as requested by the examiner. Figure 5 has not been so designated since the applicants are not convinced that figure 5 represents prior art rather than possible inventive subject matter. It is believed that the attached set of drawings overcome all the examiner's objections. The attached replacement drawings are believed to be in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d).

Re: paragraph 4 of the office action, the disclosure has been amended on page 4, line 20 as requested by the examiner.

Re: paragraph 6 of the office action, claims 6-10 were rejected under 35 USC 101 as defining non-statutory subject matter. Claim 6 has been revised as helpfully suggested by the examiner. Claims 7-10 are dependent from claim 6 and do not require further amending.

Re: paragraph 8 of the office action, independent claims 1 and 6 were rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by Nabeshima (US patent 6, 687,224). This rejection is respectfully traversed and is considered moot as subsequently discussed.

Re: paragraph 11 of the office action; dependent claims 2, 7, 12, and 17 were rejected over Nabeshima. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Re: paragraph 12 of the office action; dependent claims 5, 10, 11, 15, 16, and 20 were rejected over Nabeshima in view of well-known prior art. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Re: paragraph 13 of the office action which objected to claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 14, 18, and 19 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but stated that they would be allowable if written in independent form to include all limitations of the base claim

and any intervening claims. These claims have been revised as helpfully suggested by the examiner and are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

The following describes the claim revisions:

Claim 3 was canceled after being incorporated into claim 1 as suggested by the examiner. This should render claim 1 allowable. Claim 2 is dependent upon claim 1 which is now believed to be allowable. Claim 4 was amended and depends on amended claim 1 and should thus be allowable. Claim 5 depends upon amended claim 1 and should now be allowable.

Claims 6 through 11 to were similarly amended with dependent claim 8 being canceled after being incorporated into independent claim 6. This should render newly amended claim 6 allowable. Dependent claims 7, 9, and 10 are dependent upon amended independent claim 6 and should therefore be allowable.

Claims 11 though 15 were similarly amended with claim 13 being canceled after being incorporated into independent claim 11 which should now be allowable. Remaining claims 12, 14, and 15 are dependent upon amended claim 11 and should be similarly allowable.

Claims 16 through 20 were similarly amended with claim 18 being canceled after incorporation into independent claim 16. The remainder of claims 17, 19, and 20 are dependent upon amended independent claim 16 and should therefore be allowable.

The above claim revisions are believed to be in compliance with the examiner's helpful suggestions. Each of independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 was revised to incorporate the subject matter of dependent claims 3, 8, 13, and 18, respectively, which were then canceled. This should put independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 in condition for allowance. All remaining dependent claims are dependent upon an allowable base claim and should be in condition for allowance. This amendment requests revisions to the amended claims to correct grammatical and editorial errors and to better define the claimed subject matter. These amendatory changes do not alter the scope of the claimed subject matter and do not induce new matter.

The 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections should now be moot since the claims have been revised as helpfully suggested by the examiner to put them in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 21 November 2007

/Donald M. Duft/

Donald M. Duft (Reg. No 17,484)
Duft, Borsen & Fishman, LLP
1526 Spruce Street, Suite 302
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 786-7687
(303) 786-7691 (fax)